## CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed electronically with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the below date:

Date: May 24, 2007 Name: Jasper W. Dockrey Signature: /Jasper W. Dockrey/

В	R	١N	K	S
Н	0	F	Е	R
G	IL	. s	0	N
&	L	0	N	Ε

Case No. 9905/18 EP/FM BIF023240/US

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

	)			
Jean-Charles Souriau	)			
Serial No.: 10/731,382	<ul><li>) Examiner:</li><li>) Dinh D. Chiem</li></ul>			
Filing Date: December 8, 2003	Group Art Unit:			
For: OPTICAL ARRANGEMENT WITH TWO OPTICAL INPUTS/OUTPUTS AND	2883			
PRODUCTION METHODS	Confirmation No.: 4537			
Commissioner for Patents P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 Sir:	TRANSMITTAL			
Attached is/are:  Renewed Request for Reconsideration and Withdray	und of Final Office Action			
Renewed Request for Reconsideration and Withdrav Fee calculation:	wal of Final Office Action			
	month extension of time under 37 C.F.R. & 1.136(a)			
An extension fee in an amount of \$ for amonth extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).  A petition or processing fee in an amount of \$ under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17().				
A petition or processing fee in an amount of \$  Fee payment:				
	amount of \$ A copy of this Transmittal is enclosed			
The Director is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional filing fees required under 37 CFR § 1.16 and any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR § 1.17 associated with this paper (including any extension fee required to ensure that this paper is timely filed), or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-1925.				
	Respectfully submitted,			
May 24, 2007	/Jasper W. Dockrey/			
Date	asper W. Dockrey (Reg. No. 33,868)			

#### CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed electronically with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the below date:

Date: May 24, 2007 Name: Jasper W. Dockrey Signature: /Jasper W. Dockrey/

Case No. 9905/18 EP/FM BIF023240/US

### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:		
Jean-Charles Souriau		
Serial No.: 10/731,382	Examiner: Dinh D. Chiem	
Filing Date: December 8, 2003	Group Art Unit: 2883	
For: OPTICAL ARRANGEMENT WITH		
TWO OPTICAL INPUTS/OUTPUTS AND / PRODUCTION METHODS	Confirmation No.: 4537	

## Renewed Request For Reconsideration And Withdrawal Of Final Office Action

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In the Advisory Action of May 15, 2007, the Examiner stated that "the limitation 'at least partially optical component' changed the scope of the invention since prior to the amendment the examiner considers the 'component' to be only optical." The applicants assert that the Examiner is mistaken regarding the contents of the applicants' claim. Claim 1 as submitted with the applicants' response of December 7, 2006 is reproduced below.

1. (Currently amended) An optical arrangement comprising two parallel plates each with a through-hole forming defining an optical input/output with a given having an optical axis and an at least partly optical component placed between the plates, the at least partly optical component and a first plate of the two parallel plates comprising first fastening studs placed transversely opposite the first plate and connected by first bumps made of comprising a meltable

Appl. Ser. No. 10/731,382 Response to Advisory Action of May 15, 2007 Reply dated May 24, 2007

material that when molten is able configured to selectively wet these the first fastening studs in order to optically align the at least partly optical component and the optical input/output of the first plate, and wherein the two parallel plates comprising further comprise second fastening studs placed transversely opposite the plate two parallel plates and connected by second bumps made of comprising a meltable material that when molten is able configured to selectively wet the second fastening studs in order to optically align the optical input/output inputs/outputs on the two parallel plates. (Claim 1 emphasis added)

The first instance of the claim term "at least partly optical component" is shown above in boldface print. This claim term already existed in claim 1 at the time that the applicants filed there response of December 7, 2006. The underlined term was added in the response only to preserve proper antecedent basis in the claim. This addition does not represent any change to the scope of the claim, as asserted by the Examiner in the Advisory Action of May 15, 2007.

The applicants again request reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection set forth in the Office Action of March 23, 2007. The finality of the Office Action is grounded on the assertion that the applicants' amendment of their claims in their response of December 7, 2006 justifies the final rejection. The applicants reiterate their assertion that, in their response of December 7, 2006, they amended their claims only to address matters of form. These amendments did not substantively alter the scope of their claims. The MPEP instructs Examiners to anticipate amendments to address matters of form and that such amendments do not support issuance of a final office action. MPEP 706.07(a).

Respectfully submitted.

/Jasper W. Dockrey/ Jasper W. Dockrey Registration No. 33,868 Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE P.O. BOX 10395 CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610 (312) 321-4200